Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,843	PLANKENHORN, DANIEL J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Theresa T Snider	1744	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) _Theresa T Snider_.

(3) _____.

(2) _Michael Didas_.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _30 July 2004_

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
1-58 and 60-74

Prior art documents discussed:
Hester

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-413B (04-03)

Examiner Initiated Interview Summary

Paper No. 20040730

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Mr. Didas to receive clarification of amended claim 67. The figures and specification did not appear to support 'the cleaning ribbon being configured to form a particle trap between the length of the ...take-up reel' The particle trap appeared to be formed after the cartridge is inserted into a cleaning apparatus rather than in the cartridge by itself (figs.2 and 10). Examiner explained how in Hester, the space between #32 and #27 in figure 2, could be considered a particle trap as claimed. Mr. Didas proposed claim language that was more in line with the specification and figures and would avoid Hester as a reference. Exmaienr agreed to the proposed change, which will be entered as an Examiner's Amdt, and the claims will all be allowable.